



December 17TH, 2018

Dear Editor of World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery,

The authors are submitting the revised version of the manuscript entitled **"Intraoperative cell salvage with autologous transfusion in liver transplantation"**.

The authors have performed all the revisions suggested by reviewer number 3 (the other 3 reviewers had no suggestions). The enclosed manuscript was carefully revised by a Native English speaker. All authors approved the final version of this manuscript and there are no interest conflicts. There was no funding source for this study. The authors believe both the data and the grammar of the enclosed manuscript to be of enough quality to deserve publication in your prestigious journal.

Respectfully yours,

Prof. Dr. Marcio F. Chedid, M.D., Ph.D.,

Division of Gastrointestinal Surgery and Liver Transplantation,,

Hospital de Clinicas de Porto Alegre,

Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS)

Porto Alegre (RS), Brazil

E-Mails: mchedid@hcpa.edu.br and marciochedid@hotmail.com

POINT-BYPOINT LETTER

Detail of Review

Reviewer Name: Anonymous
Review Date: 2018-12-02 19:23
Specific Comments To Authors: A very relevant topic that should merit publication
Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)
Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)
Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments To Authors (File):

AUTHORS' RESPONSE: Thank you.

Detail of Review

Reviewer Name: Anonymous
Review Date: 2018-11-29 12:23
Specific Comments To Authors: Dear Authors, it was a pleasure to read your review, which I found complete and very good in methodology. Sincerely
Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)
Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)
Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments To Authors (File):

AUTHORS' RESPONSE: Thank you.

The peer-review report for the manuscript **Intraoperative cell salvage with autologous transfusion in liver transplantation**

Authors: **Marcelo A. Pinto, Marcio F. Chedid, Leo Sekine, Andre P. Schmidt, Rodrigo P. Capra, Carolina Prediger, João E. Prediger, Tomaz J. M. Grezzana-Filho and Cleber R.P. Krueel**

The overall structure of the manuscript is complete. It contains title, abstract, key words, introduction, and the main body, conclusion and references.

Scientific question proposed in the manuscript: to evaluate the use of intraoperative blood salvage transfusion (IBSA) during liver transplantation in both patients with cancer and benign diseases to minimize intraoperative use of allogeneic blood, preventing negative transfusion effects without negatively impacting clinical outcomes. This is clearly presented in the abstract, the Introduction section, along with the background, rationale, aim, major findings and potential significance of the review. Collectively, this informs the reviewer that the manuscript would be interesting enough to warrant readers' attention

(3) In this manuscript authors present analysis of 56 references about the use of intraoperative blood salvage autotransfusion (IBSA) in both patients with cancer and benign diseases

(4) The source of the presented data is reliable by the information presented in the manuscript. The authors adequately understand and cite all of the important references in to support the overall explanation of their findings. The authors' appropriately use citations to support the information presented throughout the main body of the manuscript. The authors clarify the historic evolution of the relevant research, and they clearly present the academic significance of the main findings (including figures and tables).

(5). The authors provide adequate analysis and discussion on the basis of the current literature and also address some key scientific and technological issues in the relevant fields. The results answered the proposed scientific question, as the aim of the study.

AUTHORS' RESPONSE: Thank you.

(6) Authors clearly presented their conclusions in the appropriate sections of the main body and in the conclusion section.

AUTHORS' RESPONSE: Thank you.

(7) The manuscript references section contains important, relevant and timely references.

AUTHORS' RESPONSE: Thank you.

(8) The manuscript was composed to answer the proposed scientific question.

(9) The manuscript conforms to the academic rules and norms that include a human and animal rights statement, institutional review board statement, informed consent statement, clinical trial registration statement, institutional animal care and use committee statement, animal care and use statement, biostatistics statement, and conflict-of-interest statement

(10) The manuscript shows that the use of IBSA is indicated in LT because the possibility of bleeding exceeding 20% of total blood volume is anticipated, being considered safe and cost-effective. Although the

use of IBSA should be encouraged, concerns remain about the safety of IBSA in specific scenarios, such as the treatment of liver tumors with intraperitoneal rupture and in patients with sickle cell anemia.

(11) The manuscript contribute to understanding of screening and diagnosis of disease

AUTHORS' RESPONSE: Thank you.

(12) The title of the manuscript contains key words, and is the interesting enough to attract readers' attention.

(13) The topic of the manuscript fall within the scope of the World Journal of Clinical Oncology

(14) The language of the manuscript reaches the standard of publishing with few errors to be corrected.

AUTHORS' RESPONSE: We have corrected all the errors in the revised manuscript.

3 Peer-reviewers' conclusions

(1) What are the new visions that the manuscript offers to readers?

The use of IBSA is indicated in LT because the possibility of bleeding exceeding 20% of total blood volume is anticipate, being considered safe and cost-effective. Although the use of IBSA should be encouraged, concerns remain about the safety of IBSA in specific scenarios, such as the treatment of liver tumors with intraperitoneal rupture and in patients with sickle cell anemia.

(2) Are there any weaknesses or deficiencies in the manuscript?

It needs minor language polishing.

AUTHORS' RESPONSE: We have corrected all the minor language errors in the revised manuscript.

(3) Can the experiences and lessons presented in the manuscript improve the readers' practice?

Yes.

AUTHORS' RESPONSE: Thank you.

(4) Does the content of the manuscript have value for publication? If not, rejection should be recommended.

Yes

AUTHORS' RESPONSE: Thank you.

(5) Is the manuscript concise, clear, comprehensive, and convincing?

Yes.

2018/11/28

Reviewer 02944288

AUTHORS' RESPONSE: Thank you.